

Terms of Reference

GEF Country Portfolio Evaluation: Eritrea (1992-2012)

Background and Introduction

1. Country Portfolio Evaluations (CPEs) are one of the main evaluation streams of work of the GEF Evaluation Office¹. By capturing aggregate portfolio results and performance of the GEF at the country level they provide useful information for both the GEF Council and the countries. CPEs' relevance and utility will increase in GEF-5 with the increased emphasis on country ownership and country driven portfolio development.
2. GEF eligible countries are chosen for portfolio evaluations, based on a selection process and a set of criteria including the size, diversity and maturity of their portfolio of projects². Among several considerations, Eritrea was selected as it is a part of Sub-Saharan Africa and also a 'Least Developed Country'. Eritrea has a comparatively large, diverse and mature portfolio with emphasis on climate change and biodiversity and has high co-financing amounts. Furthermore, Eritrea includes several ongoing projects as well as those that are on the verge of implementation.
3. Eritrea is situated in an arid and semi-arid region of Sub-Saharan Africa. After a war lasting approximately 30 years, it gained independence in 1991. It is bordered by Sudan in the west, Ethiopia in the south, and Djibouti in the southeast with Asmara as the capital of the country. The northeastern and eastern parts have an extensive coastline along the Red Sea, directly across from Saudi Arabia and Yemen. The nation has a total area of approximately 120,000 km² (45,406 sq mi), including approximately 390 islands, the prominent being the Dahlak Archipelago and several of the Hanish Islands³.
4. Eritrea is a multi-ethnic country, with nine recognized ethnic groups namely the Afar, Bilen, Hidarb, Kunama, Nara, Rashaida, Saho, Tigre, and Tigrinya. The estimated population is around six million. Most residents speak Afro-Asiatic languages, either of the Semitic or Cushitic branches. Among these communities, the Tigrinya make up about 55% of the population and the Tigre constitute around 30%. In addition, there is a number of Nilo-Saharan speaking Nilotic ethnic minorities⁴.
5. Despite its small land area, Eritrea has diverse climate zones, mainly due to its high topographic variations. Physiographically the country is divided into the Central Highlands (above 2000 m from sea level), the Midlands (1500-2000 m from sea level) and the Lowlands (below 1500 m from sea). The rainfall pattern is affected by this topographic variation in the country; annual rainfall varying from about 100mm in the lowlands to about 700mm in the central highlands. Further, Eritrea is divided in six agro-ecological zones, namely, the Moist Highland, Arid Highland, Sub-Humid, Moist Lowland and the Semi-Desert. The variations in

¹ A complete list of countries having undergone CPEs can be found on Office's website (www.gefeo.org).

² http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/CPE_final_country_selection_note-0910_0.pdf, Website access: 1st May 2013

³ Eritrea's Initial National Communication, UNFCCC, Pub: The State of Eritrea Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, December 2001.

⁴ Eritrea's Initial National Communication, UNFCCC, Pub: The State of Eritrea Ministry of Land, Water and Environment, December 2001.

mean annual temperature range from 15°C in the moist and arid highlands to 32°C in the semi-desert⁵.

6. The Human Development Index (HDI) is 0.351, giving country a rank of 181 out of 187 countries. The HDI of Sub-Saharan Africa as a region increased from 0.366 in 1980 to 0.475 today, thus placing Eritrea below the regional average⁶. Since independence from Ethiopia in 1991, Eritrea has economic problems similar to other small, developing country states, accentuated by the recent implementation of restrictive economic policies⁷. However, According to the World Bank's June 2012 Global Economic Prospects, Eritrea became one of the fastest growing African economies in 2011, with growth in gross domestic product (GDP) projected at 14%, up from an estimated 2.2% in 2010, The growth was mainly stimulated by favorable harvest and the mining sector (mainly gold), which has attracted substantial foreign direct investment⁸. However, growth in absolute terms is small. Eritrea is one of the least developed countries in the world, with an average annual per capita income of US\$403 in 2010.

7. The predominant economic activity for more than two thirds of the population is the rain-fed agriculture. It is a risky enterprise, and food security remains one of the government's main concerns. Favorable rains and rehabilitation of rural infrastructure have led to improved agricultural performance and food security in the last three years. Large fiscal and trade deficits are managed through price, exchange rate and interest rate controls, which have led to a shortage of foreign exchange and a fall in private sector activity. The size of the public debt in proportion to GDP is a concern. The official annual inflation rate rose to 13.3% in 2011, from 11.6% in 2010, but much improved compared to 29.5% in 2009. In the longer term, sustained real economic growth of 7% or more will be required for to reach the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) of halving the proportion of people living in extreme poverty by 2015.

8. Major environmental issues faced by Eritrea are continued deforestation, desertification, soil erosion, overgrazing, and significant land loss as a result of the presence still of hundreds of thousands of land mines. Significant strides towards sustainability and environmental recovery have been made by the Government of Eritrea. It has embarked on a program to reforest (which in 1900 was 30% forested land, despite heavy logging) and prevent wood from being used as a fuel source. Land Degradation is a central issue causing serious concern. Lack of proper land use practices is the primary cause of degradation. In the central and the northern highlands, the land degradation is mainly due to water erosion.

9. As the main form of land use in Eritrea is agriculture and pastorals, land management is the prime concern to protect the arable land from land degradation. The major constraint facing soil conservation and water management have been the traditional land tenure system known as 'Dessa' System (village ownership). The heavy dependence on biomass fuel has led to aggravated deforestation, soil erosion and flooding.

10. Deforestation is another cause of concern, with a fall of forest cover to less than 1% as compared to 30% in the last century. Factors like agriculture expansion, increased firewood consumption, heavy livestock grazing, internal strife and construction of traditional houses known as 'Hidmo'⁹ in rural are associated with the loss of forest cover.

⁵ <http://www.fao.org/ag/AGP/AGPC/doc/Counprof/eritrea/Eritrea.htm#3>. CLIMATE AND AGRO ECOLOGICAL, Website access 2nd May 2013

⁶ <http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/ERI.html>, Website access 1st May 2013

⁷ http://www.indexmundi.com/eritrea/economy_profile.html, Website access 1st May 2013

⁸ <http://www.worldbank.org/en/country/eritrea/overview>, Website access 2nd May 2013

⁹ It is estimated that 100 trees have to be felled to be felled to construct one such tradiontla house (Environment Eritrea, 1995)

11. Water is also a scarce commodity in Eritrea, with no perennial water source, all rivers and their tributaries being mostly seasonal and intermittent. Ground water is the major source of water. But no drinking water standards have been formulated which resulted in increase in water pollution affecting the quality of ground water. There is high amount of fluoride which is also a chemical detrimental to human health. Sanitation and solid waste management are other issues that need to be addressed. Industrialisation in Eritrea started quite early which resulted in industrial pollution as the machinery and technology can be outdated. The total quantity of hazardous liquid waste generated from the industries is to the tune of 3,640 metric/year¹⁰.

12. GEF has been active in Eritrea since 1992 with 12 national projects. The portfolio includes 3 climate change projects, 4 projects in biodiversity, 1 multi focal area projects, 2 in POPs and 2 in land degradation (Table 1). The total GEF grant is approximately \$22.62 million with \$41.55 million of co-financing. The Eritrean projects are evenly spread within the GEF project cycle with 4 projects completed, 2 projects under implementation and 6 pending (these include CEO, Council and Agency approved).

13. The portfolio in Eritrea is split as follows: UNDP has been a main channel for support with 6 projects totaling over \$15.13 million in GEF budget; World Bank has implemented \$0.44 million in GEF support through 2 projects; IFAD has 1 project with a total GEF budget of \$4.35 million and UNEP, UNDP, FAO also with 1 project each having GEF budget of \$0.19 million, \$0.34 million and \$2.15 million respectively. Respective co-financing amounts by focal area are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: GEF Support to National Projects by Focal Area and GEF Agency

Focal Area	Agency	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-financing Amount (\$)	Total Amount (\$)	of Projects
Climate Change	UNDP	2,454,411	2,953,136	5,407,547	3
	Subtotal	2,454,411	2,953,136	5,407,547	3
Biodiversity	World Bank	445,000	15,000	460,000	2
	UNDP	10,864,000	11,395,400	22,259,400	2
	Subtotal	11,309,000	11,410,400	22,719,400	4
Multi Focal Area	UNEP	198,000	20,000	218,000	1
	Subtotal	198,000	20,000	218,000	1
POPs	FAO	2,150,000	3,209,153	5,359,153	1
	UNIDO	346,500	35,000	381,500	1
	Subtotal	2,496,500	3,244,153	5,740,653	2
Land Degradation	UNDP	1,820,000	2,250,000	4,070,000	1
	IFAD	4,350,000	21,678,000	26,028,000	1
	Subtotal	6,170,000	23,928,000	30,098,000	2
TOTAL		22,627,911	41,555,689	64,183,600	12

¹⁰ Srikanth, R. Challenges of Environmental Management in Eritrea – A case study, Department of Environment, Asmara, Eritrea.

Objectives of the evaluation

14. The purpose of the Eritrea CPEs is to provide the GEF Council with an assessment of results and performance of the GEF supported activities in the country, and of how the GEF supported activities fit into the national strategies and priorities as well as within the global environmental mandate of the GEF. Based on this overall purpose, the Eritrea CPE will have the following specific objectives:

- Evaluate the **effectiveness and results**¹¹ of GEF support in a country, with attention to the **sustainability** of achievements at the project level and **progress toward impact** on global environmental benefits.
- Evaluate the **relevance** and **efficiency**¹² of GEF support in Eritrea from several points of view: national environmental frameworks and decision-making processes, the GEF mandate of achieving of global environmental benefits, and GEF policies and procedures.
- Provide **feedback** and **knowledge** sharing to (1) the GEF Council in its decision making process, (2) Eritrea on its collaboration/participation in the GEF, and (3) the different agencies and organizations involved in the preparation and implementation of GEF support.

15. The Eritrea CPE will also be used to provide information and evidence to other evaluations being conducted by the Office; for example the Small Grants Programme evaluation and the the Fifth Overall Performance Study (OPS5) to the GEF Replenishment Committee.

16. The Eritrea CPE will analyze the performance of individual projects as part of the overall GEF portfolio, but without rating such projects. CPEs are conducted to bring to the attention of Council different experiences and lessons on how the GEF is implemented at the national level from a wide variety of countries. CPEs do not aim at evaluating the performance of GEF agencies, national entities (agencies/departments, national governments or involved civil society organizations), or individual projects.

Key Evaluation Questions

17. GEF CPEs are guided by a set of key questions that should be answered based on the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the evaluative information and perceptions collected during the evaluation exercise. The Eritrea CPE will be guided by the following key questions:

Effectiveness, results and sustainability

- a) Is GEF support effective in producing results at the project level,
- b) the aggregate level (portfolio and program) by focal area?country level?
- c) Is GEF support effective in producing results that build on previous lessons learned and good practices from GEF projects and partners?
- d) Is GEF support effective in producing results that are making progress to impact after project completion?

¹¹ From the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2010: **Effectiveness**: the extent to which the GEF activity's objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance; **Results**: in GEF terms, results include direct project outputs, short- to medium-term outcomes, and progress toward longer term impact including global environmental benefits, replication effects, and other local effects; **Sustainability**: the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits for an extended period of time after completion; projects need to be environmentally as well as financially and socially sustainable.

¹² **Relevance**: the extent to which the activity is suited to local and national environmental priorities and policies and to global environmental benefits to which the GEF is dedicated; **Efficiency**: the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible.

- e) Is GEF support effective in replicating/up-scaling the successful results it has demonstrated in its projects?
- f) Is the GEF support effective in linking environmental conservation measures with compatible sustainable livelihood and development activities for achieving global environmental benefits?
- g) Is GEF support effective at developing institutional and individual capacity within Eritrea?
- h) Has the GEF support to Eritrea facilitated the channeling of additional resources for preventing land degradation efforts for achieving global environmental benefits?

Relevance

- a) Is GEF support relevant to the Eritrea sustainable development agenda and environmental priorities, to the country's development needs and challenges, and to national GEF focal area action plans?
- b) Is GEF support relevant to the objectives linked to the different global environmental benefits in the climate change, biodiversity, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?
- c) Are GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process in Eritrea, and if so, how has this evolved over time?
- d) To what extent have GEF- supported activities also received support from the country and/or from other donors?

Efficiency

- a) How much time, effort and financial resources (including co-financing) does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality (including SGP)?
- b) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation?
- c) What are the synergies among GEF agencies, Eritrea national institutions and other donors in support of GEF programming and implementation?
- d) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in project adaptive management and overall efficiency

18. Each of these questions is complemented by indicators, potential sources of information and methods in an evaluation matrix, which is presented in Annex 1.

Scope and Limitations

19. The Eritrea CPEs will cover all types of GEF supported activities in the country at all stages of the project cycle (pipeline, on-going and completed) and implemented by all active GEF Agencies in all active focal areas, including applicable GEF corporate activities such as the Small Grants Programme (SGP) and a selection of regional and global programs that are of special relevance to these countries. However, the main focus of the evaluation will be the projects implemented within the country boundaries, i.e. the national projects, be these full-size, medium- size or enabling activities. ¹³The stage of the project will determine the expected CPE

¹³ The review of selected regional projects will feed in the aggregate assessment of the national GEF portfolio described above

focus (see Table 2).

Table 2. Focus of evaluation according to stage of project

Project Status	Focus		On a exploratory basis	
	Relevance	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Results/Benefits
Completed	Full	Full	Full	Full
On-going	Full	Partially	Likelihood	Likelihood
Pipeline	Expected	Processes	Not applicable	Not applicable

20. The GEF does not establish country programs that specify expected achievements through programmatic objectives, indicators, and targets. However, since 2010 the GEF has started supporting countries in undertaking national portfolio formulation exercises on a voluntary basis. These exercises serve as a priority setting tool for countries and as a guide for GEF Agencies as they assist recipient countries. These country programming efforts are rather recent, which limits their usefulness in country portfolio evaluations that look back up to the start of GEF operations, i.e. sometimes 20 years back. This is why generally CPEs entail some degree of retrofitting of frameworks to be able to judge the relevance of the aggregated results of a diverse portfolio of projects. Accordingly, the CPE evaluation framework described here will be adapted along with the other relevant national and GEF Agencies' strategies, country programs and/or planning frameworks as a basis for assessing the aggregate results, efficiency and relevance of the GEF portfolio in Eritrea.

21. GEF support is provided through partnerships with many institutions operating at many levels, from local to national and international level. It is therefore challenging to consider GEF support separately. The Eritrea CPE will not attempt to provide a direct attribution of development results to the GEF, but address the *contribution* of the GEF support to the overall achievements, i.e. to establish a credible link between what GEF supported activities and its implications. The evaluation will address how GEF support has contributed to overall achievements in partnership with others, through analysis on roles and coordination, synergies and complementarities and knowledge sharing.

22. The assessment of results will be focused, where possible, at the level of outcomes and impacts rather than outputs. Project-level results will be measured against the overall expected impact and outcomes from each project. Special attention will be paid to the identification of factors affecting the level of outcome achievements and progress to impact, as well as to the risks that may prevent further progress to long term impacts. Outcomes at the focal area level will be primarily assessed in relation to catalytic and replication effects, institutional sustainability and capacity building, and awareness.

23. Progress towards impact of a representative sample of mature enough projects¹⁴ (i.e. completed at least since 2 years) will be looked at through field Reviews of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) studies. Expected impacts at the focal area level will be assessed in the context of GEF objectives and indicators of global environmental benefits.

24. The inclusion of regional and global projects increases the complexity of this type of evaluations since these projects are developed and approved under different context (i.e. regional or global policies and strategies) than national countries.

25. Within the national portfolio, 4 full size project are completed, 2 full size projects are under implementation and 6 pending (includes CEO, Council and Agency approved – 4 full-size and 2 enabling activity). The context in which these projects were developed, approved

¹⁴ It is expected that at least two ROtIs would be conducted.

and are being implemented constitutes another focus of the evaluation. This includes a historic assessment of the national sustainable development and environmental policies, strategies and priorities, legal environment in which these policies are implemented and enforced, GEF Agencies country strategies and programs and the GEF policies, principles, programs and strategies.

Methodology

26. The Eritrea country portfolio evaluation will be conducted by staff of the GEF Evaluation Office and staff and consultants from ECOSOC. The team includes technical expertise on the national environmental and sustainable development strategies, evaluation methodologies, and GEF.¹⁵

27. ECOSOC staff qualifies under the GEF Evaluation Office Ethical Guidelines, and have signed a declaration of interest to indicate no recent (last 3-5 years) relationship with GEF support in the country. The Operational Focal Point in the country will act as resource person in facilitating the CPE process by identifying interviewees and source documents, organizing interviews, meetings and field visits.

28. The methodology includes a series of components using a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods and tools. The expected sources of information include:

- Project level: project documents, project implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, reports from monitoring visits, and any other technical documents produced by projects;
- Country level: national sustainable development agendas, environmental priorities and strategies, GEF-wide, focal area strategies and action plans, global and national environmental indicators;
- Agency levels: country assistance strategies and frameworks and their evaluations and reviews;
- Evaluative evidence at country level from other evaluations implemented either by the Office, by the independent evaluation offices of GEF Agencies, or by other national or international evaluation departments;
- Interviews with GEF stakeholders, including the GEF Operational Focal Point and all other relevant government departments, bilateral and multilateral donors, civil society organizations and academia (including both local and international NGOs with a presence in the country), GEF Agencies, SGP and the national UN conventions' Focal Points;
- Interviews with GEF beneficiaries and supported institutions, municipal governments and associations, and local communities and authorities;
- Surveys with GEF stakeholders in the country;
- Field visits to selected project sites, using methods and tools developed by the Office such as the or the Review of Outcomes to Impact (ROtI) Handbook;
- Information from national consultation workshops.

¹⁵ The team from ECOSOC headed by Mr. Tessfa Mariam Tekie (Team Leader and Socio-Economist) and composed of Mr. Weldetensea Tewelde (Senior researcher and Associate Professor in Geography in the College of Social Science), Mr. Weldelessie Okubazghi (Senior researcher and Associate Professor in Plant Production Ecology and Resources Conservation in the College of Agriculture) and Mulubrhan G/yohannes Mehreteab.

29. The quantitative analysis will use indicators to assess the relevance and efficiency of GEF support using projects as the unit of analysis (that is, linkages with national priorities, time and cost of preparing and implementing projects, etc.) and to measure GEF results (that is, progress towards achieving global environmental impacts) and performance of projects (such as implementation and completion ratings). Available statistics and scientific sources, especially for national environmental indicators, will also be used.

30. The Evaluation Team will use standard tools and protocols for the CPEs and adapt these to the national and regional context. These tools include a project review protocol to conduct the desk and field reviews of GEF projects and interview guides to conduct interviews with different stakeholders.

31. The Eritrea CPE will include visits to project sites. The criteria for selecting the sites will be finalized during the implementation of the evaluation, with emphasis placed on both ongoing and completed projects. The evaluation team will decide on specific sites to visit based on the initial review of documentation and balancing needs of representation as well as cost-effectiveness of conducting the field visits.

32. Quality assurance will be performed on the final report by a Quality Assurance Panel composed of two national independent national experts¹⁶. The expertise provided covers the relevant scientific and technical aspects of the peer review function related to the GEF focal areas as well as to evaluation.

Process and Outputs

32. These country-specific TOR have been prepared based on two GEF Evaluation Office visits to Eritrea in February and April 2011. The first mission was conducted with the purpose of assessing institutional and human capacity for joint management, quality assurance and national conduct of the evaluation. The 2nd mission was for scoping the evaluation and identifying key issues to be included in the analysis. The scoping mission was also an opportunity to officially launch the evaluation and introduce the selected consultants to GEF national stakeholders. These TOR conclude the preparatory phase, and set the scene for the evaluation phase, during which the Evaluation Team will collect information and review literature to extract existing reliable evaluative evidence and prepare specific inputs to the CPE, including:

- the **GEF Portfolio Database** which describes all GEF support activities within the country, basic information (GEF Agency, focal area, implementation status), their implementation status, project cycle information, GEF and co-financing financial information, major objectives and expected (or actual) results, key partners per project, etc.
- **Country Environmental Legal Framework** which provides an historical perspective of the context in which the GEF projects have been developed and implemented in Eritrea. This document will be based on information on national environmental legislation, environmental policies of the government administration (plans, strategies and similar), and the international agreements signed by Eritrea presented and analyzed through time so to be able to connect with particular GEF support.
- **Global Environmental Benefits Assessment** which provides an assessment of the country's contribution to the GEF mandate and its focal areas based on appropriate indicators, such as those used in the System for the Transparent Allocation of

¹⁶ The following individuals comprise the Quality Assurance Panel

Resources (STAR) (biodiversity, climate change and land degradation) and others used in projects documents.

- **Review of Outcomes to Impact (RotI)** Field studies of three projects completed since at least 2 years, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- The Evaluation Team will also **conduct additional field visits** of other (3-5) ongoing and/or completed national projects, including those from the Small Grants Programme (SGP) Portfolio of projects¹⁷, selected in consultation with the Evaluation Office staff, which will contribute to strengthen the information gathering and analysis on results.
- Conduct the **evaluation analysis and triangulation** of collected information and evidence from various sources, tools and methods. This will be done during a mission to Eritrea by the Office's Task Manager working with the ECOSOC team. The aim will be to consolidate evidence gathered thus far, identify missing information and analysis gaps and arrive at preliminary findings. These will be summarized in a concise **Aide Mémoire**, which will be distributed to stakeholders one week prior to the final consultation workshop.¹⁸ During this mission, additional analysis, meetings, document reviews and/or field work might be undertaken as needed.
- Conduct a **Stakeholder Consultation Workshop** for the Government and national stakeholders, including project staff, donors and GEF Agencies, to present and gather stakeholders' feedback on the GEF Eritrea CPE key preliminary findings, contained in the Aid-Mémoire and circulated prior to the workshop. The workshop will be an opportunity to verify eventual errors of facts or analysis in case these are supported by adequate additional evidence brought to the attention of the Evaluation Team. The workshop will also aim at identifying potential areas of recommendations and verify their concreteness and feasibility;
- Prepare a **Draft GEF Eritrea CPE Report**, which incorporates comments received at the final consultation workshop. The draft report will be sent out for factual error checking as well as errors of analysis to stakeholders;
- Consider the eventual incorporation of comments received to the draft report and prepare the **Final Eritrea CPE Report**. The GEF Evaluation Office will bear full responsibility for the content of the report.

Evaluation Key Milestones

33. The evaluation will be conducted between February and September 2013. The key milestones of the evaluation are presented here below:

Preparaton	Status
Preparatory work, preliminary data gathering	Completed in January 201
Pre-evaluation mission	Completed in February 2013
Evaluation Workplan	Completed in March 2013
Evaluation matrix	Completed in March 2013
Quality control/peer review, finalization and disclosure of Eritrea-specific CPE TOR	June 2013

¹⁷ Field visits to SGP projects will be undertake when opportunistic in relation to other field work.

¹⁸ The Aide Mémoire will be circulated to GEF stakeholders with an invitation to the final consultation workshop.

Milestone	Deadline
Launching evaluation phase, literature review, data gathering	March 2013
Country Environmental Legal Framework	July 2013
Global Environmental Benefits Assessment	July, 2013
Data collection/interviews, GEF portfolio database and project review protocols	March-August, 2013
Finalization of the GEF country portfolio database	August 2013
Two ROtI field studies	August 2013
Consolidation and triangulation of evaluative evidence, additional analysis/gap-filling	Week of July 22, 2013
Preparation of a Aid Mémoire (Report of Preliminary Findings)	August 31, 2013
Presentation of Preliminary Findings in a Consultation workshop	Week of September 16, 2013
Draft CPE report for circulation	October 1, 2013
Delivery of final CPE report	October 15, 2013

Eritrea CPE Report Outline

34. The CPE report will be a concise, stand-alone document organized along the following general table of contents:

CHAPTER 1. Main Conclusions and Recommendations

- Background
- Objectives, Scope and Methodology
- Conclusions
 - Results and effectiveness
 - Relevance
 - Efficiency
- Lessons
- Recommendations

CHAPTER 2. Evaluation Framework

- Background
- Objectives and Scope
- Methodology
- Limitations

CHAPTER 3. Context

- The under analysis: General description
- The Global Environmental Facility: General description
- Environmental resources in key GEF support areas
- The environmental legal framework in Eritrea
- The environmental policy framework in Eritrea

CHAPTER 4. The GEF portfolio in Eritrea

- Defining the GEF Portfolio
- Activities in the GEF Portfolio
- Evolution of GEF Support by Focal Area and by GEF Agency
- Corporate, Regional and Global Programs
- Roles and Responsibilities among Different Stakeholders in Project Implementation
- The GEF Focal Point Mechanism in Eritrea

CHAPTER 5. Results of GEF support to the Eritrea

Global Environmental Benefits/Impacts
Catalytic and Replication Effects
Institutional Sustainability and Capacity Building
Results by Focal Area
Knowledge Generation and Learning

CHAPTER 6. Relevance of the GEF support in The Republic of Eritrea
Relevance of GEF Support to the Country's Sustainable Development Agenda
and Environmental Priorities
Relevance of GEF Support to Country's Development Priorities and Challenges
Relevance of GEF Support to National Action Plans within GEF Focal Areas
Relevance of GEF Support to the achievement of Global Environmental Benefits
Relevance of the GEF Portfolio to Other Global and National Institutions

CHAPTER 5. Efficiency of GEF supported activities in The Republic of Eritrea
Time, Effort, and Financial Resources Required for Project formulation
Coordination and synergies
Monitoring and Evaluation for Project Adaptive Management

ANNEXES

- A. Country Response
- B. Quality Assurance statement
- B. Country-specific Terms of Reference
- C. Evaluation Matrix
- D. Interviewees
- E. Sites Visited
- F. Workshop Participants
- G. GEF Portfolio in Eritrea
- H. Bibliography

TECHNICAL DOCUMENTS

- 1. Country Environmental Legal Framework
- 2. Global Environmental Benefits Assessment
- 3. ROI Field Studies

ANNEX 1: EVALUATION MATRIX GEF CPE ERITREA 1992-2012

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
Effectiveness, results and sustainability			
a) Is GEF support effective in producing results (outcomes and impacts) at the project level, aggregate (portfolio and program) level and country level? Are these results (project level) sustainable?	Overall project outcomes and impacts of GEF support	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs	Focus groups and individual interviews
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Desk review, project review protocols
	Changes in global benefit indexes and other global environmental indicators	Evaluative evidence from projects and donors, global environmental benefits assessment	Literature review, meta analysis of evaluation reports, national and global state of environment reports
	Overall project outcomes and impacts of GEF support	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOS	Focus groups and individual interviews
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
	Sustainability ratings for projects that are still under implementation re likelihood that objectives will be achieved	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	GEF Portfolio aggregate analysis
	Catalytic and replication effect on national and regional programs	Data from overall projects and other donors, , including evaluation studies by other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
		Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives	Focus groups and individual interviews
	Use of tracking tools and monitoring and evaluation data?	Data from overall projects and other donors, including evaluation studies by other donors	Desk review
		ROtI studies	ROtI methodology
	Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs	Focus groups and individual interviews	
	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Desk review, project review protocols
b) Is GEF support effective in producing results related to the dissemination of lessons learned in GEF projects and with partners? If so, how are such lessons shared in-country?	Existing ratings for project outcomes (self-ratings and independent ratings)	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Desk review, project review protocols
	Dissemination of positive impacts of GEF projects and best practices into national development plans and other channels to	project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives civil society staffs (NGOs and academia),	Focus groups and individual interviews

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	mainstream lessons from GEF projects		
	Lessons learned are shared nationally and regionally and models/interventions are in use	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), ROTI studies, project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government Representatives, NGOs and academia	Desk review, ROTI methodology, GEF portfolio and pipeline analysis
c) Has GEF support led to progress toward impact over an extended period of time after completion?	Continued existence of the intended change/activity beyond the GEF support	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.); Project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; ROTI studies	Desk review, focus groups and individual interviews, project review protocols, ROTI methodology, GEF portfolio analysis
	Availability of financial and technical resources to carry out the interventions beyond GEF funding		
	Ownership of projects by local institutions or by beneficiary groups who continue to engage with the interventions		
d*) Is the GEF support effective in creating individual capacity at national, regional and local levels?	Evidence of individual capacity improvement by credentials and performance	Project related reviews; project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; NGOs and academia, ROTI studies, evaluation studies by other donors	Project Review Protocols, focus groups and individual interviews, ROTI methodology
e*) Is the GEF support effective in strengthening institutional capacity at national, regional and local levels?	Evidence of institutional capacity strengthening by institutional creation, performance measures, staffing or budget	Project related reviews; project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; ROTI studies, NGO reps	Project Review Protocols, focus groups and individual interviews, ROTI methodology
f) Is the GEF support effective in linking environmental conservation measures with compatible sustainable livelihood and development activities for achieving global environmental benefits?	Incorporation of livelihood needs into project design	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations (TE), TE reviews, etc.); project staffs and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs, academia	Desk Project Review Protocols, stakeholder consultations (focus groups and individual interviews)
	Evidence of environmental stress reduction; status improvement Evidence of livelihood improvements among communities who are dependent	Project-related reviews, ROTI studies, project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives and civil society representatives (NGO and academia),	Project Review Protocols, ROTI methodology, GEF portfolio analysis, stakeholder consultation

* For the purposes of analysis, the review of the key question concerning individual capacity and institutional strengthening has been split.

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	on natural resources	evaluation studies by other donors	
	% allocated for livelihood support from the total support?	Project related reviews; project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives, NGOs and academia	Project review protocols, focus groups and individual interviews
g) Is GEF support effective in replicating/up-scaling the successful results it has demonstrated in its projects?	Institutions continue the projects or use lessons to provide services and interventions Evidence of an increase in the use of similar interventions. Catalytic up-scaling & replication effects	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations (TE), TE reviews, etc.); Data from overall projects and other donors; ROTI studies	Desk review; Project Review Protocols, Meta-analysis, ROTI methodology, Focus groups and individual interviews
h) Has GEF support facilitated the channelling of additional resources for preventing land degradation as a means to achieve global environmental benefits?	Evidence of land degradation prevention projects/activities as supported by the Govt/other donors National/regional policies (agriculture, forestry, envmt, etc) to slow the rates of land degradation Active monitoring of land degradation by government/non-government entities	Project staff and beneficiaries, national and local government representatives; Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations (TE), TE reviews, etc.); Data from overall projects and other donors, including evaluation studies; ROTI studies	Desk Review, Project Review Protocols, individual interviews, RotI, Meta-evaluation
Relevance			
a) Is the GEF support relevant to the national sustainability development agenda and environmental priorities, the national development needs and challenges and national GEF focal area action plans?	GEF support for environmental protection is within Eritrea's development vision and national strategies, including strategies for progress towards the Millennium Development Goals?	Eritrean relevant sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases, evaluation studies by other donors	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality, and project status (National), selected key person interviews Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	Level of GEF support compared to other development partners in activities prioritized in national sustainable development and environmental policies and legislations	GEE focal point and its agencies, government authorities and others)	(national)
	GEF support has country ownership and is Eritrea based (i.e. project origin, design and implementation)	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
		Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines, etc.
			Meta-evaluation
	GEF supports development needs (i.e., income generating, capacity building) and reduces challenges	Relevant country level sustainable development and environment policies, strategies and action plans	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality and project status (national)
	The GEF's various types of modalities, projects and instruments are in coherence with country's needs and challenges	Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluations reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases	
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
	Country Legal Environmental Framework	Literature review, timelines etc.	
	GEF support linked to the national environmental action plan (NEAP); national communications to UNFCCC; national POPs; National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA); adaptation to climate change (NAPA), etc.	GEF-supported enabling activities and products (NCSA, NEAP, NAPA, national communications to UN Conventions, etc.)	Desk review
		Small Grant Programme country strategy	
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
b) Are GEF and its Agencies supporting environmental and sustainable development prioritization, country ownership and decision-making process in Eritrea? And if so, how has this evolved over time?	Level of GEF funding compared to other development assistance in the environmental sector and development activities	Available databases (global such as World Bank, ADB, etc, and national, such as Ministry of Finance. planning and economy, Ministries responsible for Environment etc)	Desk reviews and meta-analysis for evaluating financing information to assess contributions of government, donors, private and civil society organizations
	Co-financing rate (from Government, private sector and/or civil society)		

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	GEF support has Eritrean ownership and is country based (i.e. project design and implementation by in-country national institutions)	Project design and implementation documents, evaluation studies from other donors, Government officials, agencies' staff, donors, and civil society representatives	Desk review, stakeholder consultation (focus group discussions, individual interviews)
	Relevant national policies and strategic documents include set of priorities that reflect the results and outcomes of relevant GEF support	STAR/RAF documents, Project-related documentation	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
		Country environmental legal framework	
c) Is the GEF support in Eritrea relevant to the objectives linked to the different Global Environmental Benefits in the climate change, biodiversity, international waters, land degradation, and chemicals focal areas?	GEF Project outcomes and impacts are in line with the Global Benefit Index (for biodiversity and climate change) and with other global indicators for greenhouse gases, POPs, land degradation, and international waters	National Conventions action plans and reference/links in the RAF, STAR documents.	Desk review, project field visits, project review protocols
		Global environmental benefits Assessment	Literature review
	GEF support linked to meeting national commitments to conventions	Project-related documentation (project document and logframe, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, and so on), PMIS, Agencies' project databases,	GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality, and project status (national)
		Government officials, Agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives (including NGOs and academia)	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews)
		Global environmental benefits Assessment	Literature review
d) To what extent have GEF-supported activities also received support from the country and/or from other donors?	GEF activities, country commitment and project counterparts support GEF mandate and focal area programs and strategies (catalytic and replication, etc.)	GEF Instrument, Council decisions, focal area programs and strategies,	Desk review; GEF portfolio analysis by focal area, Agency, modality, and project status (national) Meta evaluation
	Co-financing amounts National and regional budgets for environmental protection activities Donor support to non-GEF supported environmental activities	Project-related documentation (project document and log frame, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS, Agencies' project databases, evaluation studies from other donors	
			GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
		Global environmental benefits assessment	Literature review
		Country environmental legal framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.
	Level of funding from Eritrean Government for GEF projects and its trajectory over time	National allocations for related projects (Ministry of Finance and economy, Ministry responsible for environment)	Government documents and interviews with officials
e) Are there tradeoffs between the relevance of GEF support to Eritrea's national priorities versus the relevance to Global Environmental Benefits?	Alignment of Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) to national sustainable development priorities (i.e. encouraging economic development/poverty reduction in a sustainable manner)	Comparison of country context/national development strategies and GEB (through country context and GEB assessment)	Desk review
	Contribution of GEF projects to support or integrate environment objectives into the larger development agendas.	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
		Project-related documentation, STAR/RAF strategy documents	GEF portfolio analysis
		Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)
	Country Environmental Legal Framework	Literature review, timelines, historical causality, etc.	
Alignment of international projects to meeting local/regional sustainable development priorities and needs	Government officials, agencies' staff, donors and civil society representatives	Stakeholder consultation (focus groups, individual interviews, national workshop)	
Efficiency			
a) How much time, effort and financial resources does it take to formulate and implement projects, by type of GEF support modality in Eritrea?	Process indicators: processing timing (according to project cycle steps), preparation and implementation cost by type of modalities etc. Financial spending timeline intact with plans Plans are adapted as necessary Financial allocations are used as scheduled	Project-related documentation (project documents and log frames, implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), PMIS and Agencies project databases.	Desk review, GEF portfolio analysis, timelines

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
	Projects drop-outs from PDF and cancellations	GEF Secretariat and Agencies' staff and government officials, GEF focal point	Individual interviews, field visits, project review protocols
	GEF vs co-financing	National and local government officials, donors, NGOs, beneficiaries	
b) What role does Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) play in project adaptive management and overall efficiency?	Use of M&E inputs to guide the project towards achieving results Consideration of lessons learned? Tracking tools used, correctly filled in	Project-related documentation especially progress reports, terminals and terminal evaluation reviews.	Desk reviews, GEF portfolio analysis, interviews with GEF agencies, focal point
	Project learning provides information for decisions for future projects, programs, policies and portfolios.	Project termination reports, policy makers/government officials, GEF secretariat and agencies staff, project reports	Desk review, interviews with GEF agencies, focal point.
c) What are the roles, types of engagement and coordination among different stakeholders in project implementation?	Types of actors involved and levels of participation Working relationships between partners/ stakeholders	Project-related documentation (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc)	Meta evaluation (review of other donor reports) Desk review and Portfolio Analysis, stakeholder analysis
	Roles and responsibilities of GEF actors defined Capacity gaps defined	Project-related documentation (implementation/progress reports) Project staff, government officials, beneficiaries	
	Coordination and exchange of information/knowledge/lessons between GEF projects		
	Existence of a national coordination mechanism for GEF support	GEF Secretariat staff and technical staff from GEF Agencies, and GEF operational focal point staff	Interviews, field visits, institutional analysis
d) Are there synergies for GEF project programming and implementation among: GEF Agencies, national institutions,	Acknowledgments among GEF agencies and institutions of each other's projects	Project-related reviews (implementation reports, terminal evaluations, terminal evaluation reviews, etc.), evaluations from other donors	Desk review, interviews, and field visits

Questions	Indicators	Sources of information	Method
GEF projects, and other donor-supported projects and activities?	Effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations and between national institutions	GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other) Project staff, national and local government officials, beneficiaries	
	Budget allocations and alignment of GEF projects to carry out these activities	Government documents and data and information from officials.	Document review, Interviews
	Effective communication and technical support between GEF project agencies and organizations and between national institutions	GEF Agency staff, national executing agencies (NGOs, other) Project staff, national and local government officials, beneficiaries	